

E 457

.2

.A15

FLM
2015
092587

Copy 2

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00001739931





ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S RECORD

ON THE SLAVERY QUESTION.

HIS DOCTRINES CONDEMNED BY HENRY CLAY.

THE MASS OF LINCOLN'S SUPPORTERS HOSTILE TO
THE CONSTITUTION.

LINCOLN'S COURSE IN CONGRESS ON THE MEXICAN
WAR.

THE HOMESTEAD BILL,—“LAND FOR THE LANDLESS,”
LINCOLN, DOUGLAS, AND HAMLIN.

MR. LINCOLN, against whom we shall utter no word which is not strictly true, was an “Old-Line Whig.” Hence his friends make great efforts to show that he stands upon the slavery question where the Whig party of other days stood, and that his opinions are accordant with those of HENRY CLAY. It will be our purpose to expose the fallacy—the entire hollowness, indeed—of this assertion. It will not be denied that the agitation of the slavery question is the main staple of the Republican party. Mr. LINCOLN is the chief of the agitators to-day, and stands really in advance of Mr. SEWARD, as the author of the “Irrepressible Conflict.” But let us try Mr. LINCOLN's doctrines by those of HENRY CLAY.

THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW.

In his speech at Freeport, Illinois, on the 27th of August, 1858, in reply to certain questions propounded by Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LINCOLN said:—

“As to the first one, in regard to the Fugitive Slave law, I have never hesitated to say, and I do not now hesitate to say, that I think, under the Constitution of the United States, the people of the Southern States are entitled to a Congressional Fugitive Slave law. Having said that, I have had nothing to say in regard to the existing Fugitive Slave law, further than that *I think it should have been framed so as to be free from some of the objections that pertain to it, without lessening its efficiency.* And, inasmuch as we are not now in an agitation in regard to an alteration or modification of that law, I would not be the man to introduce it as a new subject of agitation upon the general question of slavery.”

The objections to the Fugitive Slave law of 1850 are, that it is inhuman, and unconstitutional in this,—that it deprives the fugitive of the right of habeas corpus and trial by jury, and confers upon commissioners judicial powers. It is sufficient to say, as to the first

objection, that if the law be inhuman, so was the act of 1793, which passed the Senate unanimously, the House of Representatives by a vote nearly unanimous, and was signed by GEORGE WASHINGTON. As to the constitutionality of the law, we have only to refer to the decision of the Supreme Court in *Ableman vs. Booth*, and *The United States vs. Booth*. The court say:—

“But, although we think it unnecessary to discuss these questions, yet, as they have been decided by the State court and are before us on the record, and we are not willing to be misunderstood, it is proper to say that, in the judgment of this court, *the act of Congress commonly called the Fugitive Slave law is, IN ALL ITS PROVISIONS, fully authorized by the Constitution of the United States.*”—21 Howard's Rep., p. 526.

That was the unanimous opinion of the court, including Justices McLEAN and CURTIS. And yet nine-tenths of Mr. LINCOLN's supporters deny the constitutionality of the law, and trample it under foot whenever opportunity occurs.

The act of 1793 proved inefficient, and hence the act of 1850 was substituted therefor. The disposition of Mr. LINCOLN to give the South an efficient law for the recovery of fugitive slaves can be readily tested by his action as a Representative in Congress. On Monday, January 8, 1849, Mr. MEADE, of Virginia, moved the suspension of the rules in the House of Representatives, to enable him to offer the following resolution:—

“Whereas, it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to enact all laws necessary to enforce such provisions of the Constitution as were intended to protect the citizens of the several States in their rights of property, and past experience has proved that laws should be passed by Congress to enforce the second section of the fourth article of the Constitution, which requires that persons held to labor in

any one State, escaping to another, shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such labor may be due: therefore,

"Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary is hereby instructed to report a bill to this House, providing effectually for the apprehension and delivery of fugitives from labor who have escaped or may hereafter escape from one State into another."—*Cong. Globe*, vol. xx. p. 188.

The vote on the suspension of the rules was yeas 79, nays 100; and the motion to suspend the rules, two-thirds not voting in the affirmative, was rejected. Among the nays was ABRAHAM LINCOLN. By that vote Mr. LINCOLN indicated his opposition to any law providing more effectually than the act of 1793 for the recovery of fugitive slaves. We have already seen, from his speech at Freeport, that the act of 1850 is, in his judgment, objectionable,—in other words, a bad law. Now let us see how far he agrees in these respects with Mr. CLAY's recorded opinions.

HENRY CLAY ON THE FUGITIVE SLAVE ACTS OF 1793 AND 1850.

As chairman of the Committee of Thirteen, Mr. CLAY reported to the Senate the Compromise Bill of 1850. With reference to the recovery of fugitive slaves, the report says:—

"An owner of a slave, it is quite notorious, cannot pursue his property, for the purpose of its recovery, in some of the States, without imminent personal hazard. This is a deplorable state of things, which ought to be remedied. The law of 1793 has been found wholly ineffectual, and requires more stringent enactments. *There is especially a deficiency in the number of public functionaries authorized to afford aid in the seizure and arrest of fugitives.* * * * Numerous petitions have been presented, praying for a trial by jury in the case of arrest of fugitives from service or labor in the non-slaveholding States. It has been already shown that *this would be contrary to practice and uniform usage in all similar cases.* Under the name of a popular law and cherished institution,—an institution, however, never applied in cases of preliminary proceedings, and only in cases of final trial,—*there would be a COMPLETE MOCKERY of justice*, so far as the owner of the fugitive is concerned."—*Cong. Globe*, vol. xxi. part 1, pp. 945, 946.

Thus it seems that Mr. CLAY considered the act of 1793 "wholly ineffectual," and "more stringent enactments" necessary. To show that he approved the act of 1850 for the recovery of fugitive slaves,—ill health kept him from the Senate when that measure was finally passed,—it is only necessary to direct attention to the "Declaration and Pledge" which, at the next session of the same Congress, in common with forty-two others, members of Congress, representing all sections and parties, Mr. CLAY solemnly made, "not to support for the office of President, Vice-President, or of Senator, or Representative in Congress, or as a member of a State Legislature, ANY MAN, OF WHATEVER PARTY, who is not opposed to the disturbance" of the settlement [of the Slavery question] "effected by the compromise passed at the last session of Congress."—See *Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. xxix. p. 480, where it will be found.

The Fugitive Slave law was one of the com-

promises of 1850, and a vital one, without which the others would have failed.

THE DUTY OF CITIZENS UNDER THE FUGITIVE SLAVE ACT.

Upon this point—the duty of citizens to aid in the execution of the law, and not to harbor fugitive slaves—Mr. CLAY was emphatic. In his speech on his Compromise Resolutions, in the Senate, on the 6th of February, 1850, he said:—

"I do not say that a private individual is obliged to make the tour of his whole State in order to assist the owner of a slave to recover his property; but *I DO say*, if he is present when the owner of a slave is about to assert his rights and regain possession of his property, *that he, that every man present*, whether officer or agent of the State Governments, or private individual, *is BOUND TO ASSIST in the execution of the laws of the country.*"—*Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. xxii. part 1, p. 122.

Again, in the Senate, on the 13th of May, 1850, he said:—

"Sir, there is one opinion prevailing—I hope not extensively—in some of the non-slaveholding States which nothing we can do will conciliate. I allude to that opinion that asserts that *there is a higher law*—a divine law—a natural law—*which entitles a man, under whose roof a runaway has come, to give him assistance, and succor, and hospitality.* Where is the difference between receiving and harboring a known fugitive slave AND GOING TO THE PLANTATION OF HIS MASTER AND STEALING HIM AWAY? A divine law! a natural law! And who are they that venture to tell us what is divine and what is natural law? Where are their credentials of prophecy?"—*Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. xx. part 1, p. 572.

VIEWS OF MR. LINCOLN'S LEADING FRIENDS ON THE SAME SUBJECT.

Extract of JOSHUA R. GIDDINGS's letters to Hon. THOMAS CORWIN, in 1859:—

"In your last speech at Xenia, you say it is the sacred duty of every good citizen to obey the law when the Legislature and Judiciary have decided it such. *This doctrine of submission is unsuited to our age.* * * * Republicans hold it the sacred duty of every good citizen to RESIST despotism in every shape, although approved by the Legislature and by the Judiciary. They look upon that man as already enslaved who fears to speak and act his own enlightened convictions. Submission to despotic power has become the disgrace of our nation. The doctrine has become offensive to every friend of liberty.

"You further say, if men disobey the law you would bring their heads to the block,—provided the law should require it. This declaration of hostility to the Republicans generally was unnecessary and unkind. Had it come from a slaveholder or servile Democrat, it would have excited no attention. *The Republicans of Lorain county trampled upon that law, rescued a fellow-being from slavery, and set him at liberty. They indicted the men who recaptured him, and would have sent them to the penitentiary HAD NOT THE ADMINISTRATION RECEDED FROM ITS ATTEMPTS TO PUNISH THE RESCUERS AND PERMITTED THE FUGITIVE TO ENJOY HIS FREEDOM.* You would bring their heads to the block."

Extract of the speech of Hon. OWEN LOVEJOY, of Illinois, in the House of Representatives, February 21, 1860:—

"No human being, black or white, bond or free, native or foreign, infidel or Christian, ever came to my door and asked for food and shelter, in the

In Exchange

Peabody Inst. of Balto.

June 14 1927

name of a common humanity or of a pitying Christ, who did not receive it. This I have done. This I mean to do, as long as God lets me live. I shall never 'betray him that wandereth.' I shall never become a slave-catcher. * * *

"Is it desired to call attention to this fact? Proclaim it, then, upon the house-tops. Write it on every leaf that trembles in the forest, make it blaze from the sun at high noon and shine forth in the milder radiance of every star that bedecks the firmament of God. Let it echo through all the arches of heaven, and reverberate and bellow along all the deep gorges of hell, where slave-catchers will be very likely to hear it. Owen Lovejoy lives at Princeton, Illinois, three-quarters of a mile east of the village, and he aids every fugitive that comes to his door and asks it. Thou invisible demon of Slavery, dost thou think to cross my humble threshold and forbid me to give bread to the hungry and shelter to the houseless? I BID YOU DEFIANCE IN THE NAME OF MY GOD!"*

Extract of the speech of Hon. CHARLES B. SEDGWICK, of New York, in the House of Representatives, March 26, 1860:—

"We do not propose the repeal of this law; let it stand, a fit monument to the folly and madness of the times; but is it not enough to try the *temper*, as well as the faith, of the believer in human progress, that such a law could be passed by an enlightened Republic in the nineteenth century, and that it is made not only the test of the citizen's loyalty to his country, but of the Christian's to his God? It must have been expected—I believe it was intended—that such a law should produce counter-legislation in the free States—that personal-liberty bills would be passed, as they have been—though not half as stringent as they ought to be—to discharge the duty which every independent State owes to each of its citizens, however humble,—I mean protection to their personal liberty.

"It must have been expected that so infamous a law would have been evaded by underground railroads and by all other honorable methods. And let me assure gentlemen that they deceive themselves if they suppose that there is any real difference in sentiment among Northern people in relation to this law. All parties wink at its evasion, and all sympathy is with the fugitive who proves, by a successful flight, that there is enough man in him to make an earnest effort for freedom. He who can suppress such sympathy, and on the requisition of the marshal, under the fifth section attempt to show that he is a good citizen by 'aiding and assisting in the prompt and efficient execution of this law whenever his services are required,' ought himself to be a slave."†

* The Chicago "Democrat," of which JOHN WENTWORTH is editor, in noticing the renomination of Mr. LOVEJOY for Congress by the Republicans of his district, said:—

"Mr. Lovejoy and Mr. Lincoln are warm personal friends and political supporters of each other. Mr. Lovejoy was in favor of the nomination of Mr. Lincoln for President, and Mr. LINCOLN would like to see Mr. LOVEJOY returned to Congress. Mr. Lincoln is for using all the constitutional means in his power for the suppression of slavery. This is all Mr. Lovejoy is for. Should Lincoln be elected President and Lovejoy returned to Congress, there is no man who would enjoy Mr. Lincoln's confidence to a greater degree than Mr. Lovejoy. There is no State in the Union where the Republicans are so sound upon the Slavery question as Illinois. Indeed, Illinois Republicans know of no other question except that between slavery extension AND SLAVERY EXTINCTION. A man that supposes that Owen Lovejoy does not speak for all the Republicans in Illinois, when he speaks in Congress, is laboring under an inexcusable delusion."

† Mr. Sedgwick does not represent public opinion at the North fairly when he says all parties "wink at" the evasion

Extract of the speech of the Hon. C. H. VAN WYCK, of New York, in the House of Representatives, March 7, 1860:—

"You reproach us because we will not do the menial service of hunting down your runaway slaves. There is not a man on this floor, of your own number, who would thus demean his manhood or disgrace his nobility. In my district, there may be two or three men who believe with you that slavery is a divine institution and ought to be extended; there are none who would resist the execution of your Fugitive Slave law; but I am frank and proud to tell you, *I do not believe there is one who would place his hand upon the heaving breast of the fleeing fugitive who is panting for liberty as the hart panteth for the water-brooks*, although there be symbols of ownership, in the brand of the master on his cheek, the rust of the iron on his limbs, and the scars of the lash on his back. No, sir! *I rejoice that there is not one who, if he gave him a cup of cold water, would not feel that he could claim the blessing, 'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me;'* not one who, if asked for bread, would give him a stone; if asked for a fish, would give him a serpent."

Extract of speech of JOHN A. BINGHAM, of Ohio, in the House of Representatives, April 24, 1860:—

"*That flagitious law [the Fugitive Slave act] insults the conscience of the people, by declaring it a crime to exercise that highest duty enjoined by God upon man,—charity. That law also discriminates most offensively in favor of slave property over all other movable property, by providing that the slave-owner, or claimant, may, on his affidavit, have his property restored to him at the national expense; while if the cattle of a Northern farmer escape into another State he must reclaim them at his own expense.*"

A small volume might be filled with similar extracts of the letters and speeches of Mr. LINCOLN's leading supporters. With a few exceptions, every man of them of prominence, in Congress or out, denounces the Fugitive Slave act as either unconstitutional or inhuman.

THE ADMISSION OF SLAVE STATES.

Mr. LINCOLN, in his speech at Freeport during the Illinois canvass of 1858, with respect to the admission of slave States into the Union, said:—

"In regard to the other question, of whether I am pledged to the admission of any more slave States into the Union, I state to you very frankly that *I would be exceedingly sorry ever to be put in a position of having to pass upon that question. I should be exceedingly glad to know that there would never be another slave State admitted into the Union; but I must add, that if slavery shall be kept out of the Territories during the territorial existence of any one given Territory, and then the people shall, having a fair chance and a clear field, when they come to adopt the Constitution, do such an extraordinary thing as to adopt a slave Constitution, uninfluenced by the actual presence of the institution*

of the Fugitive Slave law. He represents the Syracuse district, where the Abolitionists are powerful, and makes the fanaticism of his own immediate supporters the standard of public sentiment throughout the North. The Northern Democracy stand by the Constitution and yield obedience to the law; and so does the strong conservative element in the North, which, although not united with the Democracy, is hostile to the Republicans.

among them, I see no alternative, if we own the country, but to admit them into the Union."

The plain English of this is, that if slavery be not "kept out of the Territories during the territorial existence of any one given Territory." Mr. LINCOLN would be opposed, and is pledged to oppose the admission of a new State seeking admission into the Union, under such circumstances, with a pro-slavery Constitution. He is in this a few steps only behind the Ultra-ists of his party,—the rulers, in fact,—who boldly proclaim that no more slave states should be admitted into the Union. This is the doctrine of his friends in Illinois beyond question; and it is the doctrine of at least four-fifths of his supporters. Look at the resolutions passed by the Republicans in the House of Representatives of the Illinois Legislature, in February, 1855, as the platform on which a Senator should be chosen to succeed General SHIELDS. Then bear in mind that, with two exceptions, every man who voted for the resolutions offered by Mr. OWEN LOVEJOY, now a Representative in Congress, voted on the succeeding day for ABRAHAM LINCOLN for United States Senator. Here are the resolutions referred to; and it will be seen that they are as ultra as the most ultra Abolitionist will demand:—

"Whereas, Human slavery is a violation of the principles of natural and revealed rights; and whereas, the fathers of the Revolution, fully imbued with the spirit of these principles, declared freedom to be the inalienable birthright of all men; and whereas, the preamble to the Constitution of the United States avers that that instrument was ordained to establish justice, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity; and whereas, in furtherance of the above principles, slavery was forever prohibited in the old Northwest Territory, and more recently in all that Territory lying west and north of the State of Missouri, by the act of the Federal Government; and whereas, the repeal of the prohibition last referred to was contrary to the wishes of the people of Illinois, a violation of an implied compact long deemed sacred by the citizens of the United States, and a wide departure from the uniform action of the General Government in relation to the extension of slavery: therefore,

"Resolved, by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring therein, That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives requested, to introduce, if not otherwise introduced, and to vote for, a bill to restore such prohibition to the aforesaid Territories, and also to extend a similar prohibition to all territory which now belongs to the United States, or which may hereafter come under their jurisdiction.

"Resolved, That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives requested, to vote against the admission of any State into the Union the Constitution of which does not prohibit slavery, whether the territory out of which such State may have been formed shall have been acquired by conquest, treaty, purchase, or from original territory of the United States.

"Resolved, That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives requested, to introduce and vote for a bill to repeal an act entitled 'An act respecting fugitives from justice and persons escaping from the service of their masters;' and, failing in that, for such a modification of it as shall secure the right of *habeas corpus* and trial by jury before the

regularly-constituted authorities of the State, to all persons claimed as owing service or labor."

HENRY CLAY ON THE ADMISSION OF NEW STATES.

Maine and Missouri, the one a free and the other a slave State, applied for admission at the session of Congress of 1819-20. The North opposed the admission of Missouri, because of the slavery clause in her Constitution, and the South, in retaliation, opposed the admission of Maine. Mr. CLAY, in his speech at that crisis in our history, said:—

"He thought that Maine ought to be admitted into the Union; he thought the same of Missouri; and, although he might be forced to withhold his assent to the admission of Maine if a majority of this House should (which he trusted they would not) impose unconstitutional restrictions on the admission of Missouri, he should do it with great reluctance."—*Annals of Congress*, 1819-20, p. 842.

And, in 1850, when Mr. SOULÉ, of Louisiana, on the 15th day of June, offered the following amendment to the Compromise bill, Mr. CLAY voted for it:—

"And when the said Territory, [New Mexico,] or any portion of the same, shall be admitted as a State, it shall be received into the Union WITH OR WITHOUT SLAVERY, as the Constitution may prescribe at the time of admission."—*Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. xxii. part 2, pp. 902, 911.

SLAVERY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. LINCOLN's views as to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia by Congress will be found in the following extract of his speech at Freeport, Illinois, in 1858, from which we have already quoted:—

"The fourth one is in regard to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. In relation to that I have my mind very distinctly made up. I should be exceedingly glad to see slavery abolished in the District of Columbia. I believe that Congress possesses the constitutional power to abolish it. Yet, as a member of Congress, I should not, with my present views, be in favor of endeavoring to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, unless it would be upon these conditions: *First*, that the abolition should be gradual; *second*, that it should be on a vote of the majority of qualified voters in the District; and *third*, that compensation should be made to unwilling owners. With these three conditions, I confess I would be exceedingly glad to see Congress abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and, in the language of Henry Clay, 'sweep from our Capital that foul blot upon our nation.'"

Mr. LINCOLN, since his first appearance in public life, has modified his views somewhat on this subject: still, they differ widely from those of Mr. CLAY, as we shall see presently. At this point we will remark that HENRY CLAY never, at any time in his life, proposed to "sweep away from our Capital that foul blot upon our nation,"—slavery in the District of Columbia. He never made any such assertion with respect to slavery. Mr. LINCOLN misrepresents him. The language quoted by Mr. LINCOLN was used by Mr. CLAY in reference to the slave-trade in the District of Columbia, which was abolished by Congress in 1850.

HENRY CLAY ON SLAVERY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

On the 12th of January, 1838, Mr. CLAY offered a series of resolutions in the Senate, as a substitute for the resolutions of Mr. CALHOUN on the Slavery question, one of which was as follows:—

“*Resolved*, That the interference by the citizens of any of the States with a view to the abolition of slavery in this District is endangering to the rights and security of the people of the District, and that any act or measure of Congress designed to abolish slavery in this District *would be a violation of the faith implied by the cession by the States of Virginia and Maryland, a just cause of alarm to the people of the slaveholding States, and have a direct and inevitable tendency to disturb and endanger the Union.*”—*Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. vi. p. 98.

Speaking to the subject of the resolution, Mr. CLAY said:—

“My idea in framing that resolution was to throw around the District of Columbia every security in these abstract propositions. One was, the *plighted faith* of this Government in the transaction by which the District was acquired. The next was, that you have no right to abolish slavery without indemnity. The third was, that you cannot do it without exciting a degree of alarm in the Southern States of this Union, transcending the benefits of any results.”—*Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. vi. p. 60.

On the 29th of January, 1850, Mr. CLAY introduced his celebrated “Compromise Resolutions” in the Senate. The fifth resolution was as follows:—

“*Resolved*, That it is inexpedient to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, whilst that institution continues to exist in the State of Maryland, WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THAT STATE, without the consent of the people of the District, and without just compensation to the owners of slaves within the District.”—*Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. xxii. part 2, p. 115.

Mr. CLAY addressed the Senate on the 6th day of February, 1850, on the subject embraced in the foregoing resolution. We make the following extracts of his speech:—

“While I admitted [said Mr. CLAY, alluding to his speech in the Senate in 1838] the power to exist in Congress, and exclusively in Congress, to legislate in all cases whatsoever,—and consequently in the case of the abolition of slavery within this District, if it deemed it proper to do so,—I contended upon that occasion, as I contend now, that it was a power which Congress cannot, IN CONSCIENCE AND GOOD FAITH, exercise while the institution of slavery exists within the State of Maryland.”

Again, he said:—

“This implied faith, this honorable obligation, this honesty and propriety of keeping in constant view the object of the cession,—these were the considerations which, in 1838, urged me, as they now influence me in the preparation of the resolution which I submit for your consideration. Now, as then, I do think that Congress, as an honorable body, acting in good faith, according to the nature and purpose and objects of the cession at the time it was made, and looking at the condition of the ceding States at this time,—Congress CANNOT, without forfeiture of all those obligations of honor WHICH MEN OF HONOR AND NATIONS OF HONOR WILL RESPECT as much as if they were found literally, in so many words, in the bond itself, INTERFERE WITH THE INSTITUTION OF SLAVERY

IN THIS DISTRICT, without a violation of those obligations, not, in my opinion, LESS SACRED OR LESS BINDING than if they had been inserted in the constitutional instrument itself.”—*Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. xxii. part 2, p. 121.

That speech of HENRY CLAY is a withering rebuke to Mr. LINCOLN and his supporters, who would abolish slavery in the District of Columbia under any circumstances, “without the consent of the State of Maryland.” And yet he and his supporters pretend to stand by the doctrines of HENRY CLAY!

But, while Mr. LINCOLN would not, as he said in his Freeport speech, “be in favor of endeavoring to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia” upon the conditions he put, he does not disclaim a willingness to see it abolished without those conditions.

THE INHIBITION OF SLAVERY IN THE TERRITORIES.

The only difference between Mr. LINCOLN and the Southern extremists is, that he favors Congressional intervention to prohibit slavery in the Territories, while they invoke the same power to protect and thus, in reality, to establish it, without regard to the will of the inhabitants. The Chicago Convention, which put Mr. LINCOLN in nomination for the Presidency, adopted the following, among other resolutions:—

“Eighth. That the normal condition of all the territory of the United States is that of freedom. That, as our Republican fathers, when they had abolished slavery in all our national territory, ordained that no person should be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, it becomes our duty, by legislation, whenever such legislation is necessary, to maintain this provision of the Constitution against all attempts to violate it. And we deny the authority of Congress, of a territorial Legislature, or of any individuals, to give legal existence to slavery in any Territory of the United States.”

That resolution Mr. LINCOLN is pledged to, and the doctrine which it proclaims has received his consistent support for years. As a member of the House of Representatives, during the Thirtieth Congress, from December, 1847, to March 4, 1849, he voted over and again—forty-two times, indeed—in favor of the “Wilmot Proviso.” In his speech at Freeport in 1858, in debate with Mr. DOUGLAS, he said:—

“I am impliedly, if not expressly, pledged to a belief in the right and duty of Congress to prohibit slavery in the United States Territories.”

And again, at Alton, he said:—

“What I insist upon is, that the new Territories shall be kept free from slavery while in a Territorial condition.”

The prohibition of slavery in the Territories, and denial of authority anywhere to legalize it therein, is the corner-stone of the Republican creed. What was the position of HENRY CLAY?

HENRY CLAY ON SLAVERY IN THE TERRITORIES.

In his speech in the Senate on the 5th of February, 1850, Mr. CLAY said:—

“The power, then, Mr. President, in my opinion, and I extend it to the introduction as well as to the

prohibition of slavery in the new Territories, does exist in Congress.

* * * * *

"It is better for them, I said to myself, it is better for the South, that there should be non-action as to slavery both north and south of that line,—far better that there should be non-action on both sides of the line, than that there should be action by interdiction on the one side *without action for the admission upon the other side of the line.* Is it not so?"

* * * * *

"If there be a majority who are in favor of interdicting slavery north of that line, *there ought to be a majority, if justice is done to the South, to admit slavery south of that line.*"—*Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. xxii. pp. 117, 125, 126.

Thus it is seen that Mr. LINCOLN's dogma of intervention finds no support in the opinions of HENRY CLAY. He was for non-intervention, and held that Congress could either introduce or prohibit slavery in a Territory; while Mr. LINCOLN insists that Congress has no other power except the power to prohibit.

In 1838, Mr. CLAY offered the following resolution in the Senate:—

"*Resolved*, That any attempt of Congress to abolish slavery in any Territory in which it exists would create serious alarm and just apprehension in the States sustaining that domestic institution; *would be a violation of good faith towards the inhabitants of such Territory who have been permitted to settle with and hold slaves*, because the people of such Territory have not asked for the abolition of slavery therein, and because that, when any such Territory shall be admitted into the Union, the people thereof will be entitled to decide that question for themselves."—*Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. vi. pp. 96, 97.

And the eighth in the series of his Compromise Resolutions of 1850 is as follows:—

"*Resolved*, That as slavery does not exist by law, and is not likely to be introduced into any Territory acquired by the United States from the Republic of Mexico, it is inexpedient for Congress to provide by law either for its introduction into or exclusion from any part of said Territory, and that appropriate Territorial Governments ought to be established by Congress in all of said territory not assigned as the boundaries of the proposed State of California, *without the adoption of any restriction or condition on the subject of slavery.*"—*Cong. Globe*, vol. xxi. part 1, p. 246.

Mr. CLAY twice voted against the "Wilmot Proviso" during the pendency of the Compromise Measures, first when it was offered by Mr. SEWARD, of New York, and second when it was offered by Mr. CHASE, of Ohio. (See *Senate Journal*, pp. 375, 376.) He spoke of it during the debate as "offensive" and "odious," and finally, vexed at the persistency with which it was pressed, he said:—

"It is in a high degree of probability that all the newly-acquired Territories will ultimately be dedicated to the cause of free soil, without the Wilmot Proviso. Do they hug that precious 'Wilmot' to their bosoms, that nothing but that will do? that no other obstacles, no other preventatives, to the introduction of slavery in the Territories will satisfy them but Wilmot, *Wilmot, WILMOT?*"—*Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. xxii. part 2, p. 1415.

Speaking of the Compromise Measures, Mr.

CLAY said, further, that the principle of non-intervention was the "*great principle*" which pervaded the bill. Here is his language:—

"Mr. President, the great principle which prevails through this bill is the principle of non-intervention on the subject of slavery. * * *

* * * "What, in other words, is the difference between the direct action of congressional legislation upon the subject of slavery to introduce or to prohibit it, and the exercise of this power by Congress to repeal existing laws within the Territory, which laws have declared the abolition of slavery? If it is so, the great principle of non-intervention seems to be as clearly violated in attempts to repeal local laws as it could be violated in attempts by the power of Congressional enactments to introduce or prohibit slavery."—*Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. xxii. part 2, p. 1417.

Again, he said:—

"I have said I never could vote for it myself; and I repeat that I never can and never will vote, and no earthly power will ever make me vote, to spread slavery over Territories where it does not exist. Still, if there be a majority who are for interdicting slavery north of the line, there ought to be a majority, if justice is done to the South, to admit slavery south of that line. And if there be a majority to accomplish both of these purposes, although I cannot concur in their action, yet I shall be one of the last to create any disturbance. I shall be one of the first to acquiesce in that legislation, although it is contrary to my own judgment and to my conscience. I hope, then, to keep the whole of these matters untouched by Congress upon the subject of slavery, leaving it open and undecided. Non-action by Congress is the best for the South, and best for all the views which the South have disclosed to us from time to time, as corresponding to their wishes. * * * Congress is non-acting north and south of that line; or rather, if Congress agrees to the plan which I propose, extending no line, it leaves the entire theatre of the whole cession of these Territories *untouched by legislative enactments either to exclude or admit slavery.*"—*Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. xxii. part 1, p. 126.

This extract of his speech on his Compromise Resolutions, of which the Republicans are accustomed to cite so much only as manifests his repugnance to establishing slavery in the Territories, is, in fact, among the strongest of Mr. CLAY's repeated denunciations of the doctrine of Congressional intervention contended for on the one side by the Republicans, and on the other by Southern extremists of the YANCEY school. Hence we find that Mr. CLAY voted for Mr. DOUGLAS's motion, and again for that of Mr. NORRIS, of New Hampshire, to strike out of the Compromise Bill the restriction on the Territorial Legislature from passing any law either "establishing or prohibiting African slavery."—*Cong. Globe*, vol. xxi. part 2, p. 1135; *Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. xxii. part 2, p. 1473.

On the 18th of May, 1850, in reply to Mr. JEFFERSON DAVIS, of Mississippi, Mr. CLAY spoke as follows:—

"Mr. CLAY.—I do not understand the Senator from Mississippi as proposing that if any one shall carry slaves into the Territory—although by the laws of the Territory he cannot take them—the legislative hands of the Territorial Government should be so tied as to prevent it, saying he shall not enjoy the fruits

of their labor. If the Senator from Mississippi means to say that—

“Mr. DAVIS.—I do mean to say it.

“Mr. CLAY.—If the object of the Senator is to provide that *slaves may be introduced into the Territory* contrary to the *lex loci*, and, being introduced, nothing shall be done by the Legislature to impair the rights of owners to hold slaves thus bought, I certainly cannot vote for it. * * * While I am willing to lay off the Territories without the Wilmot Proviso on the one hand, or without an attempt to introduce a clause for the introduction of slavery into the Territories,—while *I am for rejecting both the one and the other*,—I am content that the law shall prevail, and if there be any diversity of opinion as to it, *I am willing it shall be SETTLED by the highest judicial authority of the country.*”—*Cong. Globe*, vol. xxi. part 1, p. 1003.

On another occasion, Mr. CLAY said:—

“The provisions of the bill are that the *people are left free to do as they choose*. There is, indeed, one provision which did not meet with my approbation, and with which I would have been better satisfied had it been left out, and that is, the provision which does not permit the government of the Territories to ESTABLISH OR PROHIBIT SLAVERY. But it was introduced at the instance of some Southern gentlemen.”—*Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. xxii. part 2, p. 1410.

And, again, in speaking of slavery in the Territories:—

“Is it not a much more fitting subject for the consideration of the *local Legislatures* which we propose, by this bill or some other bill, to establish—is it not, I say, a much more fitting subject for such *local Legislatures* to consider? We have never been among them; we know nothing of them: but the Legislatures of the localities will be particularly informed of its operation, and if it is oppressive, or tyrannical, or injurious, they will doubtless repeal it.”—*Cong. Globe*, vol. xxi. part 2, p. 1142.

These extracts of Mr. CLAY's speeches prove that he occupied the precise position on the subject of slavery in the Territories in 1850 which Mr. DOUGLAS held then and holds to-day. They prove, further, that his doctrines and those of Mr. LINCOLN and his supporters are not only discordant, but widely asunder. The “Old-Line Whig,” therefore, who follows Mr. LINCOLN as a disciple of HENRY CLAY, follows a false pretender and hugs a delusion.

We shall close this branch of our subject by an extract of Mr. CLAY's speech of May 13, 1850, as further evidence of his hostility to the “Wilmot Proviso,” which was neither more nor less than Mr. LINCOLN's pledge to inhibit slavery in the Territories. He said:—

“What are we looking at? The ‘Proviso’—an abstraction always—thrust upon the South by the North against all the necessities of the case, against all the warnings which the North ought to have listened to, coming from the South; pressed unnecessarily for any Northern object; opposed, I admit, by the South with a degree of earnestness uncalled for, I think, by the nature of the provision, but with a degree of earnestness natural to the South, and which the North, perhaps, would have displayed if a reversal of the condition of the two sections of the Union could have taken place. Why do you of the North press it? You say because it is in obedience to certain sentiments in behalf of human freedom

and human rights which you entertain. You are likely to accomplish those objects at once by the progress of events, without pressing this obnoxious measure. You may retort, ‘Why is it opposed at the South?’ It is opposed at the South, *because the South feels that when once legislation upon the subject of slavery begins, there is no seeing where it is to end*. Begin it in the District of Columbia, begin it in the Territories of Utah and New Mexico and California; assert your power there to-day, AND IN SPITE OF YOUR PROTESTATIONS—and you are not wanting in making protestations—that you have no purpose of extending it to the Southern States, what security can you give them that a new sect will not arise with a new version of the Constitution, or with something above or below the Constitution, which shall authorize them to carry their notions into the bosoms of the slaveholding States, and endeavor to emancipate from bondage all the slaves there? Sir, the South has felt that *her security lies in denying at the threshold your right to touch the subject of slavery.*”—*Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. xxii. part 1, p. 581.

THE DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT AND THE HIGHER LAW DOCTRINE.

Mr. LINCOLN professes to be a believer in the declaration of Mr. BUCHANAN that slavery exists in the Territories by virtue of the Constitution of the United States. His construction of the opinion in the “Dred Scott Case” is, that it carries slavery into the Territories in spite of the local law,—in other words, even forces it on a reluctant people. And yet, so believing, in his speech at Chicago, on the 10th of July, 1858, Mr. LINCOLN said:—

“If I were in Congress, and a vote should come up on a question whether slavery should be prohibited in a new Territory, *in spite of the Dred Scott decision*, I would vote that it should.”

That is the doctrine uniformly held by the Republican party. They care nothing for the decisions of courts where slavery is concerned unless the decisions confirm to their individual opinions. Their doctrine, and Mr. LINCOLN's doctrine, is the “higher law,” and the right of private judgment and individual action, no matter what the law may be or the courts decide.

HENRY CLAY'S OPINIONS ON THE SAME SUBJECT.

Mr. CLAY was a law-abiding man, and always held that the Supreme Court of the United States is the final arbiter in all disputed points of Constitutional law. He yielded implicit obedience, therefore, to its authority. Upon this subject, and especially with respect to decisions of the court touching slavery in the Territories, on the 18th of June, 1850, he addressed the Senate as follows:—

“I am willing, whether there be a local law establishing or prohibiting slavery, or whether the Constitution of the United States does or does not carry along with it the right to transport slaves into that country, (the Territories of New Mexico and Utah,) *I am willing to leave it to the Judiciary of the United States itself*; but I am not willing to abolish the local laws before that decision is given, not only because I think it would be a violation of the course which the Senate has hitherto pursued, especially in adopt-

ing the provision of the tenth section, but because it is unnecessary, if the Constitution does entitle any man to carry every description of property into those Territories."—*Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. xxii. part 2, p. 916.

At another stage of the debate Mr. CLAY said:—

"Now, what ought to be done more satisfactory to both sides of the question, to the free States and to the slaveholding States, than to apply the principle of non-intervention to the state of the law in New Mexico, and to *leave the question of slavery or no slavery to be decided by the only competent authority that can definitely settle it for ever, the authority of the Supreme Court of the United States?*"—*Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. xxii. part 2, p. 1464.

An extract of his speech in the Senate, on the 13th of May, 1850. denunciatory of the "higher law" doctrine, has been used in these pages already; but, inasmuch as the Republicans, who were originally Whigs, profess great reverence for the teaching of HENRY CLAY, we shall reproduce it. Here it is:—

"I allude [said Mr. CLAY] to that opinion that asserts that there is a higher law—a divine law—a natural law—which entitles a man under whose roof a runaway has come, to give him assistance and succor and hospitality. Where is the difference between receiving and harboring a known fugitive slave, and going to the plantation of his master and stealing him away? A divine law! a natural law! And who are they that venture to tell us what is divine and what is natural law? *Where are their credentials of prophecy?* Why, sir, we are told that the other day, at a meeting of some of these people at New York, Moses and all the prophets were rejected, and that the name even of our blessed Saviour was treated with contempt and blasphemy by those propagators of a divine law, of a natural law, which they have discovered above all human laws and constitutions. * * *

Heaven supersedes the parchment from government. *Wild, reckless, and abominable theories*, which strike at the foundation of all property and threaten to crush in ruins the fabric of civilized society."—*Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. xxii. part 1, p. 572.

NEGRO EQUALITY UNDER THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

In his speech at Chicago, in September, 1856, at a political banquet, Mr. LINCOLN, following in the lead of CHARLES SUMNER, JOSHUA R. GIDDINGS, OWEN LOVEJOY, and other fanatics of that stamp, struck out for the doctrine of negro equality with the white man. He said, (we quote from the *Illinois State Journal*, published at Springfield, of September 16, 1856):—

"That central idea, in our political opinion, at the beginning was, and until recently continued to be, the *equality of men*. And although it was always *submitted* patiently to, whatever inequality there seemed to be, as a matter of actual necessity, its constant working has been a steady progress towards the PRACTICAL EQUALITY OF ALL MEN.

"Let past differences as nothing be; and with steady eye on the real issue, let us reinaugurate the good old *central ideas* of the Republic. We can do it. The human heart is with us; God is with us. We shall again be able not to declare that all the States, as States, are equal, nor yet that all citizens,

as citizens, are equal, but renew the broader, better declaration,—including both these and *much more*,—that all *men* are created equal."

He repeated his theory that all men are created equal, and hence that there can be no inferior race rightly held in slavery at Chicago, in July, 1858. He then said:—

"My friends, I have detained you about as long as I desired to do; and I have only to say, let us discard all this quibbling about this man and the other man—this race and that race and the other race being inferior, and therefore they must be placed in an inferior position—discarding our standard that we have left us. Let us discard all these things, and unite as one people throughout this land, until we shall once more stand up DECLARING THAT ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL.

"My friends, I could not, without launching off upon some new topic, which would detain you too long, continue to-night. I thank you for this most extensive audience that you have furnished me to-night. I leave you, hoping that the lamp of liberty will burn in your bosoms until there shall no longer be a doubt that ALL MEN ARE CREATED FREE AND EQUAL."

Subsequently, at Springfield, Mr. LINCOLN, pursuing the same topic, said:—

"My declarations upon this subject of negro slavery may be misrepresented, but cannot be misunderstood. I have said that I do not understand the Declaration to mean that all men were created equal in all respects. They are not our equal in color; but I suppose that it does mean to declare that all men are equal in some respects; *they are equal in their right to 'life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.'* Certainly the negro is not our equal in color,—perhaps not in many other respects: still, *in the right to put into his mouth the bread that his own hands have earned*, he IS THE EQUAL OF EVERY OTHER MAN, *white or black*. In pointing out that more has been given you, you cannot be justified in taking away the little which has been given him. All I ask for the negro is that if you do not like him, let him alone. If God gave him but little, that little let him enjoy."

In his speech, in reply to Mr. DOUGLAS, at Ottawa, in August, 1858, Mr. LINCOLN again said:—

"I have no purpose to introduce political and social equality between the white and the black races. There is a physical difference between the two, which, in my judgment, will probably forever forbid their living together upon the footing of perfect equality; and inasmuch as it becomes a necessity that there must be a difference, I, as well as Judge Douglas, am in favor of the race to which I belong having the superior position. I have never said any thing to the contrary; but I hold that, notwithstanding all this, there is no reason in the world why the negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I HOLD THAT HE IS AS MUCH ENTITLED TO THESE AS THE WHITE MAN. I agree with Judge Douglas he is not my equal in many respects—certainly not in color, perhaps not in moral or intellectual endowment. But in the right to eat the bread, without the leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns, *he is my equal, and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every living man.*"

Divested of all speciousness, these declara-

tions of Mr. LINCOLN not only deny that there can be any property in a slave, but make the negro the equal of the white man. For if it be true, as Mr. LINCOLN contends, that the negro is equally entitled with the white man to liberty, it follows that he is entitled to, and should have, all the political privileges which the white man enjoys. There is no escape from that conclusion, if Mr. LINCOLN's dogma be correct.

HENRY CLAY'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

At Richmond, Indiana, on the 1st of October, 1842, Mr. CLAY made a speech on slavery, in reply to a petition presented to him by a Mr. MENDENHALL, asking him to liberate his slaves. The following extract relates to the Declaration of Independence and its bearing on slavery:—

"The Declaration, whatever may be the extent of its import, was made by the delegations of the thirteen States. In most of them slavery existed, and had long existed, and was established by law. It was introduced and forced upon the colonies by the paramount law of England. Do you believe that, in making that Declaration, the States that concurred in it intended that it should be TORTURED into a virtual emancipation of all the slaves within their respective limits? Would Virginia and the other Southern States have ever united in a declaration which was to be interpreted into an abolition of slavery among them? Did any one of the thirteen States entertain such a design or expectation? To impute such a secret purpose would be to charge a political fraud upon the noblest band of patriots that ever assembled in council; a fraud upon the confederacy of the Revolution; a fraud upon the union of those States whose Constitution not only recognised the laws of slavery but permitted the importation of slaves from Africa until 1808. And I am bold to say that if the doctrines of ultra political abolitionists had been seriously promulgated at the epoch of our Revolution, our glorious independence would never have been achieved,—never! never!"—*Mallory's Life and Speeches of Clay*, vol. ii. p. 597.

MR. LINCOLN'S VIEWS ON SLAVERY TEND TO ITS ABOLITION.

We acquit Mr. LINCOLN of any present wish or intention to interfere directly with slavery in the States. His principles carried to their legitimate conclusion, however, will finally encourage attempts at interference with slave property in the Southern States, similar to that of JOHN BROWN at Harper's Ferry, in Virginia. He denies that there can be property in man, and considers slavery a great moral wrong. If that be so, then any degree of violence is justifiable which may be necessary to restore the negro to the liberty which Mr. LINCOLN claims that he is "as much entitled to as the white man." It is this theory instilled into the minds of the ignorant and fanatical which excites not unfrequently riot and bloodshed when a fugitive slave is claimed by his owner in a free State. Mr. LINCOLN, with great apparent candor, is one of the most dangerous teachers of the day. His theory of "irrepressible conflict" between the free and the slave States, absurd as it is, is powerful for mischief. He may say that the Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer*,

and not he, originated the theory. That matters not: it is his by adoption, and he, in common with Mr. SEWARD and his less distinguished supporters, will be responsible for whatever of mischief it has produced or may produce hereafter. Mr. LINCOLN stated this startling theory in his speech at Springfield, on the 17th of June, 1858, as follows:—

"We are now far into the fifth year since a policy was initiated with the avowed object and confident promise of putting an end to slavery agitation. Under the operation of that policy, that agitation has not only not ceased, but has constantly augmented. In my opinion, it will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed. '*A house divided against itself cannot stand.*' I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved; I do not expect the house to fall, but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing or all the other. Either the opponents of slavery will arrest the further spread of it, and place it where the public mind shall rest in the belief that it is in the course of ultimate extinction, or its advocates will push it forward till it shall become alike lawful in all the States, old as well as new, North as well as South."

A few weeks after, Mr. LINCOLN, in a speech at Chicago, commented on the passage which we have cited from his Springfield speech, as follows:—

"He [Mr. DOUGLAS] says that I am in favor of making war by the North upon the South for the extinction of slavery; that I am also in favor of inviting (as he expresses it) the South to war upon the North for the purpose of nationalizing slavery. Now, it is singular enough, if you will carefully read that passage over, that I did not say that I was in favor of any thing in it. I only said what I expected would take place. I made a prediction only: it may have been a foolish one, perhaps. I did not even say that I desired that slavery should be put in course of ultimate extinction. I DO SAY SO NOW, HOWEVER: so there need be no longer any difficulty about that. It may be written down in the great speech."

He told his hearers in the same speech that he hated slavery as much as any Abolitionist. This was his language:—

"I have always hated slavery, I think, as much as any Abolitionist—I have been an Old-Line Whig—I have always hated it; but I have always been quiet about it until this new era of the introduction of the Nebraska bill began. I always believed that everybody was against it, and that it WAS IN COURSE OF ULTIMATE EXTINCTION."

And in a letter to the Republicans of Boston, under date of April 13, 1859, Mr. LINCOLN thus denies the right of property in a slave:—

"The Democracy of to-day hold the liberty of one man to be absolutely nothing when in conflict with another man's right of property. Republicans, on the contrary, are for both the man and the dollar, but, in case of conflict, the (negro) MAN BEFORE THE DOLLAR.

* * * * *

"This is a world of compensations; and he who would be no slave must consent to have no slave. Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and, UNDER A JUST GOD, cannot long retain it."

At Columbus, Ohio, in September, 1859, Mr. LINCOLN more fully elaborated his idea of "the ultimate extinction" of slavery than he had elaborated it in the Illinois campaign of 1858. The following is an extract of his speech:—

"In order to do so, I think we want and must have a national policy in regard to the institution of slavery, that acknowledges and deals with *that institution as being wrong*. Whoever desires the prevention of the spread of slavery and the nationalization of that institution yields all when he yields to any policy that either *recognises slavery as being right* or as being an indifferent thing. Nothing will make you successful but setting up a policy which shall *treat the thing as being wrong*. When I say this, I do not mean to say that this General Government is charged with the duty of redressing or preventing all the wrongs in the world; but I do think that it is charged with preventing and redressing all wrongs which are wrongs to itself. This Government is expressly charged with the duty of providing for the general welfare. We believe that the *spreading out and perpetuity of the institution of slavery impairs the general welfare*. We believe—nay, we know—that that is the only thing that has ever threatened the perpetuity of the Union itself. The only thing which has ever menaced the destruction of the Government under which we live is this very thing. To *repress this thing, we think, is providing for the general welfare*. Our friends in Kentucky differ from us. We need not make our argument for them, but *we, who think it is wrong in all its relations*, or in some of them at least, must decide, as to our own actions and our own course, upon our own judgment."

Now, if slavery be wrong in itself, "wrong in all its relations," as Mr. LINCOLN teaches, upon what principle can he regard, or will his party regard, the compromises of the Constitution with respect to the institution? Why should the slave States be unmolested if slavery be "*wrong in all its relations*"? And yet, with such doctrines uppermost in his favor, Mr. LINCOLN claims to be an "Old-Line Whig" and to follow in the footsteps of HENRY CLAY! How different were the views of that great statesman!

HENRY CLAY'S VIEW OF THE ALLEGED IRREPRESSIBLE CONFLICT.

Mr. CLAY spoke as follows, in the Senate, in February, 1838:—

"The slaves are here; and here they must remain, in some condition. What is best to be done for their happiness and our own? In the slave States, the alternative is that *the white man must govern the black, or the black will govern the white*. * * * This is our true ground of defence for the CONTINUED EXISTENCE of slavery in our country. It is that which our Revolutionary ancestors assumed. It is that which, in my opinion, *forms our justification in the eyes of all Christendom*."—*Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. vi. p. 387.

In the same debate, Mr. CLAY said, further:—

"But if I had been there then, or were now a citizen of any of the planting States,—the Southern or Southwestern States—I should have opposed, and would continue to oppose, any scheme whatever of emancipation, gradual or immediate, because of the danger of the ultimate ascendancy of the black race, or of a civil contest which might terminate in the

extinction of one race or the other."—*Append. Cong. Globe*, p. 358.

And in reply to Mr. CALHOUN, whose resolutions on slavery were under discussion, in January, 1838, Mr. CLAY said:—

"Why, sir, what is there to justify alarm in the mere fact of receiving a petition? ACTION, CONGRESSIONAL ACTION, ALONE, CAN JUSTIFY ALARM. The Senator thinks my resolutions make a concession. Of what? The right to abolish slavery in the States? No. They demand the instantaneous rejection of all such petitions, as being palpably beyond the powers of Congress, and therefore not even debatable. The right to abolish slavery in the District? No. The strongest grounds—stronger than the Senator's own resolutions—are assumed against it. The *right to abolish it in the Territory of Florida*? No. All considerations against it are arrayed in forcible language. The right to prohibit the sale and removal of slave from State to State? No. The constitutional power of Congress to do that is denied. And it is remarkable that, while my resolutions deny that power, his are altogether silent about it."—*Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. vi. p. 59.

As to property in slaves, Mr. CLAY said, also:—

"I know there is a visionary dogma which holds that negro slaves cannot be the subject of property. I shall not dwell long with this speculative abstraction. That is property which the law recognises to be property. Two hundred years of legislation have sanctioned and *sanctified negro slaves as property*."—*Append. Cong. Globe*, vol. vi. p. 357.

Pages could be filled with extracts of HENRY CLAY'S speeches and letters condemnatory of Mr. LINCOLN'S doctrines. There cannot be found, indeed, any vote, resolution, speech, or opinion of Mr. CLAY in harmony with Mr. LINCOLN'S expressed opinions on the question of slavery. Mr. LINCOLN leads a sectional party and appeals to one section only for support. HENRY CLAY was a national man, and hated every thing that looked to or maintained sectionalism. Here is what he said in 1850, after the passage of the Compromise Measures, when Northern Whigs—Mr. LINCOLN heartily uniting with them—evinced a disposition to repudiate the adjustment. Let all "Old-Line Whigs" and conservative men ponder his words well:—

"But if it (the Whig party) is to be merged into a contemptible Abolition party, and if Abolitionism is to be engrafted upon the Whig creed, from that moment I denounce the party and cease to be a Whig. I go yet a step further: If I am alive, I will give my humble support to that man for the Presidency *who, to whatever party he may belong, is not contaminated by fanaticism, rather than to one who, crying out all the time that he is a Whig, maintains doctrines utterly subversive of the Constitution and of the Union*."

THE SUPPORTERS OF MR. LINCOLN HOSTILE TO THE CONSTITUTION.

In our review of Mr. LINCOLN'S position with respect to the Fugitive Slave act, we took occasion to collate the denunciations, which a few of his prominent supporters have hurled against that law. The great mass of his supporters openly proclaim hostility to the law and

to the Constitution also. Obstructions are thrown in the way of the execution of the law, rescues are made, and resistance openly counselled. And yet the Republicans call theirs a National Party, and profess reverence for the Constitution!

Sixty-eight Republican members of Congress gave their endorsement—which only some seven or eight have repudiated—to one of the most atrocious books ever published, Helper's "Impending Crisis of Slavery." Here are some of the sentiments which it inculcates,—sentiments entertained by a vast number of the Republicans:—

"We enter our protest against it, and deem it our duty to use our most strenuous efforts to *overturn and abolish it*. * * * We are not only in favor of keeping slavery out of the Territories, but, carrying our opposition to the institution a step farther, we here unhesitatingly declare in favor of its IMMEDIATE and UNCONDITIONAL ABOLITION IN EVERY STATE in the Confederacy where it now exists."—Page 25 of *The Crisis*.

"The great revolutionary movement which was set on foot in Charlotte, Mecklenburg county, North Carolina, on the 20th day of May, 1775, has not yet been terminated, nor will it be until every slave in the United States is freed from the tyranny of his master."—Page 95 of *The Crisis*.

"It seems that the total number of actual slave-owners, including their entire crew of cringing lick-spittles, against whom we have to contend, is but 347,525. Against this army for the defence and propagation of slavery, we think it will be an easy matter—independent of the negroes, who in nine cases out of ten would be delighted with an opportunity of CUTTING THEIR MASTERS' THROATS, and without accepting a single recruit from the free States, England, France, or Germany—to muster one three times as large, for its utter extinction. We hope the matter in dispute may be adjusted without arraying these armies against each other in hostile attitude. * * * BUT WE ARE WEDDED TO ONE PURPOSE, FROM WHICH NO EARTHLY POWER CAN DIVORCE US. WE ARE DETERMINED TO ABOLISH SLAVERY AT ALL HAZARDS."—Page 149.

"At once let the good and true men of this country, the patriot sons of the patriot fathers, determine that the sun which rises to celebrate the centennial anniversary of our national independence shall not set on the head of any slave within the limits of this republic."—Page 178.

We have the authority of Mr. GIDDINGS, of Ohio, that every sentence of "Helper's Book"—the most odious portions of which we purposely avoid to cite—finds "a response in the hearts of all true Republicans." Mr. GIDDINGS wrote the following letter to the editor of the *Ashtabula (Ohio) Sentinel* when the name of JOHN SHERMAN was withdrawn as the Republican candidate for Speaker of the House of Representatives:—

"WASHINGTON CITY, Feb. 5, 1860.

"To the Editor of the *Ashtabula Sentinel*:—Our friends at home should be slow to censure their representatives for deserting Mr. Sherman. * * * They felt the humiliation of discarding a candidate because he had endorsed the doctrines of Helper's book, EVERY SENTENCE OF WHICH FINDS A RESPONSE IN THE HEARTS OF ALL TRUE REPUBLICANS. * * *

J. R. GIDDINGS."

So it is the country over. Every sympathizer with "Old JOHN BROWN," every violator of the Fugitive Slave law, every contemner of the Constitution, such as SUMNER and WENDELL PHILLIPS and the notorious REDPATH, is heartily for Mr. LINCOLN's election. To these incendiaries the conservative men of the country of all parties must make a bold, defiant, and successful opposition. Sectionalism, North and South, must be put down. "The Federal Union must be preserved. The Constitution must be maintained inviolate in all its parts."

MR. LINCOLN AND THE MEXICAN WAR.

Mr. LINCOLN was not a member of the House of Representatives when war was declared against Mexico. He took his seat in December, 1847, and, consequently, had no opportunity to vote but in a single instance, on a bill to provide supplies for the army. The bill referred to was to "raise for a limited time an additional military force," which was rendered necessary by the expiration of the term of service of several thousand volunteers. The bill, which was known as the "Ten Regiment bill," passed the Senate on the 18th of March, 1848, and, on the 25th, Mr. BOYD, of Kentucky, of the Committee on Military Affairs, with a view to speedy action by the House of Representatives, moved its reference to that Committee, with instructions to report immediately. The motion was voted down by yeas 87, nays 87,—Mr. LINCOLN voting in the negative. The bill came up in regular order on the 4th day of May following,—the necessity for its passage having increased meanwhile fourfold,—and Mr. BOYD moved that it be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. That motion was lost also,—yeas 74, nays 79. Mr. LINCOLN again voted in the negative. Fortunately, the treaty of peace which was communicated to Congress by the President on the 6th day of July, 1848, rendered the consideration of the bill, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, unnecessary afterwards. But, if hostilities had continued, our army in Mexico would have been seriously crippled in consequence of the refusal of Congress to grant the additional military force promptly.—*Congressional Globe*, vol. xviii. pp. 537, 725, 901.

On the 3d of January, 1848, Mr. HOUSTON, of Delaware, introduced in the House of Representatives a joint resolution of thanks to Major-General ZACHARY TAYLOR, which Mr. SCHENCK, of Ohio, moved to refer to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HENLEY, of Indiana, moved to amend by adding instructions to the committee to add to the resolutions the words, "*engaged as they were in defending the rights and honor of the nation*."

Whereupon, Mr. GEORGE ASHMUN, of Massachusetts, moved to amend the amendment of Mr. HENLEY by adding the words, "*in a war unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President of the United States*."

The amendment of Mr. ASHMUN was agreed

to, *yeas* 85, *nays* 81. Mr. LINCOLN voted in the affirmative.—*Cong. Globe*, vol. xviii. p. 95.

On the 14th of February ensuing, Mr. JAMES THOMPSON, of Pennsylvania, with a view to set aside the action of the House on the 3d of January, offered the following resolution:—

“*Resolved*, That the words of the amendment offered and adopted by the House to the resolution of thanks to Major-General Taylor on the 3d of January, 1848, containing the words ‘that the war [namely with Mexico] was unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President,’ is untrue in fact, and calculated to prevent a peace with Mexico on the basis of indemnity, and should be rescinded.”

The resolution was laid on the table,—Mr. LINCOLN voting in the affirmative,—*yeas* 105, *nays* 94.—*Cong. Globe*, vol. xviii. pp. 343, 344.

On the 17th of January, 1848, Mr. CHASE, of Tennessee, offered the following resolution:—

“*Resolved*, That it is inexpedient to order our troops to retreat from the positions which they have so gallantly won in Mexico, for the purpose of falling back on a defensive line.”

The vote on the motion to lay the resolution on the table was agreed to, *yeas* 96, *nays* 89,—Mr. LINCOLN voting in the affirmative.—*Cong. Globe*, vol. xviii. p. 179.

On the 20th day of December, 1847, Mr. LINCOLN’s colleague, Mr. WILLIAM A. RICHARDSON, offered the following resolutions with respect to the war-policy of the country:—

“*Resolved*, That the existing war with Mexico was just and necessary on our part, and has been prosecuted with the sole purpose of vindicating our national rights and honor and of securing an honorable peace.

“*Resolved*, That the rejection of our repeated overtures of peace leaves the Government no alternative but the most vigorous prosecution of the war, in such manner, consistent with the laws of nations, as will make the enemy feel all its calamities and burdens, until Mexico shall agree to a just and honorable peace, providing satisfactory indemnity in money or territory for past injuries, including the expense of the war.

“*Resolved*, That the amount of the indemnity must necessarily depend upon the obstinacy of the enemy and the duration of the war.”—*Cong. Globe*, vol. xvii. p. 59.

Mr. LINCOLN would have voted against the resolutions, had they come to a vote, for reasons which he stated in the House on the 12th day of January, 1848, and which the following extract of his speech will explain:—

“But, in addition to this, one of his colleagues (Mr. RICHARDSON) came into the House with a resolution in terms expressly endorsing the justness of the President’s conduct in the beginning of the war. So that he found himself here, IF HE WAS INCLINED TO GIVE THE PRESIDENT HIS SUPPLIES, and say nothing about the original justice of the war,—if he was inclined to go with him, to look ahead, and not back, in a position that he could not do so. He should feel compelled to vote on this resolution in the negative.”—*Cong. Globe*, vol. xviii. p. 154.

In the course of his remarks, he said, speaking of President POLK, *The blood of this war, like the blood of Abel, was crying from the ground against him.*

On the 21st of February, 1848, Mr. CHASE,

of Tennessee, asked leave to offer a joint resolution of thanks to Generals TWIGGS, WORTH, PILLOW, SHIELDS, PATTERSON, QUITMAN, PIERCE, SMITH, and CADWALLADER, and to the officers and soldiers under their command, for their gallant services in the Mexican War, and also ordering gold medals to be struck, with suitable devices, to be presented one to each of the commanding generals named in the resolutions. On the motion to suspend the rules, the vote was, *yeas* 110, *nays* 54. Mr. LINCOLN voted in the negative.—*Cong. Globe*, vol. xviii. p. 381.*

Such is Mr. LINCOLN’s record on the Mexican War, and kindred questions, as a member of Congress. We give it without comment, and leave it to the judgment of the country.

MR. LINCOLN’S DESERTION OF HENRY CLAY IN 1848.

Mr. LINCOLN, in his campaign with Mr. DOUGLAS, in 1858, in Illinois, boasted that he was the “life-long friend of HENRY CLAY;” and on this ground those who faithfully shared the political fortunes of Kentucky’s great Chief are appealed to in his support for the Presidency. This claim of Mr. LINCOLN and his immediate friends is summarily disposed of in the following extract of a speech delivered by Gen. G. W. SINGLETON, an “Old-Line Whig,” at Jacksonville, Illinois, in 1858:—

“Mr. Lincoln was the first man in Illinois who proposed to an organized body of Whigs to abandon Henry Clay and the principles of the Whig party. In or about June, 1847, the Constitutional Convention being in session, the Whig members of said convention were privately summoned to appear at the house of Ninian W. Edwards, in the city of Springfield. The meeting being organized, Mr. Lincoln explained its object to be the selection of some other man than Henry Clay as the standard-bearer of the Whig party in the coming Presidential contest. The name of Gen. Taylor was proposed by Mr. Lincoln, and the necessity of immediate action urged, on the ground that if the Whigs did not take Taylor for their candidate the Democrats would; that the Whig party had fought long enough for principle, and should change its motto to success. Resolutions being adopted by this meeting in accordance with the views expressed by Mr. Lincoln, Charles H. Constable and myself immediately left the house.

“When the Whig convention assembled in Philadelphia in 1848, Abraham Lincoln united in all the schemes against Henry Clay, and contributed there and elsewhere every thing in his power to rob that great and good man of the honors he had so richly earned by a long life of devotion to his country and to his party.

“Mr. Lincoln even went so far as to try to prevent me from taking a seat in the Philadelphia convention, and urged me to surrender my seat to Dr. Zabriskie,—Zabriskie then being a citizen of New Jersey, and not of Illinois,—because Zabriskie was for Taylor, and I was for Henry Clay, for the Presidency.

“As a member of Congress, Mr. Lincoln was

* The main question was ordered on Mr. CHASE’s resolutions, and was about to be put, when further proceedings were interrupted, and the House adjourned, in consequence of the illness of Hon. JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, who sank in his seat at the time, apparently in the agonies of death.

actively engaged, during the spring of 1848, in concocting schemes for the defeat and overthrow of Henry Clay, and finally rejoiced when he beheld the mangled remains of that great patriot and statesman inhumanly butchered by those claiming to be his friends.

"After the election of Gen. Taylor, he cast his eyes upon the Land-Office at Washington, soon to be disposed of by the President. The Whig party of Illinois, claiming that appointment, recommended Cyrus Edwards, of Madison county, who was regarded by all in the party, and out of it, with the highest veneration as a gentleman, a scholar, and a statesman.

"The recommendation of Cyrus Edwards was forwarded to Mr. Lincoln, then a member of Congress, who, instead of laying it before the President, kept it in his pocket, and pretended that he (Lincoln) was the only man that could keep Justin Butterfield from receiving the appointment. When the Whig party learned the game Lincoln had played on their old and true friend, Mr. Edwards, instead of helping him to defeat Butterfield, they, in the town of Springfield, administered to Lincoln a most severe rebuke by going for Butterfield instead of for Lincoln. From that time until within a year or two past Mr. Lincoln has been compelled to remain in retirement."

THE HOMESTEAD BILL,—“LAND FOR THE LANDLESS.”

MR. LINCOLN'S RECORD.

The supporters of Mr. LINCOLN build large hopes for his success in the present canvass for the Presidency, upon the fact that the Republicans in Congress sustained the Homestead bill. "Land for the landless" is the cry all along the Republican ranks, and thousands upon thousands of speeches and pamphlets with this title are scattered over the free States, and especially wherever we have a foreign-born population.

Now, the inquiry, in view of this clamor of his friends, arises,—“What did Mr. LINCOLN ever do to further the Homestead policy?—what to give ‘land to the landless’?” He was in Congress, as a member of the House of Representatives, for two years, and never made an effort to aid “the landless,”—never opened his lips to “secure homes for actual settlers and cultivators.” Other men—WILLIAMSON R. W. COBB, of Alabama, WILLIAM SAWYER, of Ohio, CALEB B. SMITH, of Indiana, JOHN A. MCCLERNAND and ROBERT SMITH, of Illinois, JOHN A. SLINGERLAND and HORACE GREELEY, of New York, and, above all, ANDREW JOHNSON, of Tennessee, the father of the Homestead system—did endeavor either to reduce the price of the public lands and discourage speculation in them, or to “appropriate them in limited quantities to actual settlers;” ABRAHAM LINCOLN never. A pioneer in the West, who had witnessed the evils and injustice of our land-system in its encouragement of land-jobbers and speculators, and the struggles of actual settlers to secure homes for their families, ABRAHAM LINCOLN never made an effort to abate that system and remedy its evils. Where was he when HORACE GREELEY appealed in vain, on the 27th of February, 1848, in behalf of his measure to secure “a home to every one who will claim it, without money and without price”? (*Cong. Globe*, vol. xx. p. 624.) That was the time to prove

his friendship for “the landless;” that was the occasion for Mr. LINCOLN to recognise “the principle that a man is entitled to live *somewhere*, although he has no money to buy land to live on.” Yet he, who now appeals to the actual settler and to “the landless” for support, while in Congress never countenanced them, by word, vote, or otherwise. And HANNIBAL HAMLIN, his associate on the ticket, has persistently opposed the Homestead policy, which the Republicans attempt to make their own. The Presidential candidate of the Republicans indifferent, if not actually inimical, to “the landless,” and the Vice-Presidential candidate actively hostile! Such is the position of their candidates; and yet the Republican press and Republican speakers, with the constant cry of “land for the landless,” expect to secure favor and support for them from the settlers in the new States of the West. They reckon without their host. The people will not desert steadfast friends to push on the political fortunes of LINCOLN and HAMLIN,—the one a passive and the other an active enemy of the Homestead policy. They will follow the standard of the man who has been ever true and faithful to that policy,—STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS.

MR. DOUGLAS AND THE HOMESTEAD BILL.

A bill to grant lands to actual settlers and cultivators in limited quantities—in other words, a Homestead bill—was before the Senate, at the first session of the Thirty-Fifth Congress, in 1858. It was postponed until the first Monday of January, 1859, on motion of Mr. CLINGMAN, of North Carolina, whose object was to defeat it. The vote on postponement was taken on the 27th day of May, 1858, and was as follows:—

“*Yeas*.—Messrs. Allen, Bigler, Brown, Clay, Clingman, Crittenden, Davis, Dixon, Fessenden, Fitzpatrick, Foster, Green, HAMLIN, Hayne, Houston, Hunter, Iverson, Johnson of Arkansas, Johnson of Tennessee, Kennedy, Mallory, Mason, Pearce, Polk, Reid, Sebastian, Slidell, Thompson of Kentucky, Thompson of New Jersey, and Wright.—Total, 30.

“*Nays*.—Messrs. Bell, Bright, Broderick, Chandler, DOUGLAS, Durkee, Fitch, Foot, Hale, Harlan, Jones, King, Pugh, Rice, Seward, Shields, Simmons, Stewart, Toombs, Trumbull, Wade, and Wilson.—Total, 22.”—*Cong. Globe*, vol. xvi. part 3, p. 2426.

Mr. HAMLIN voted to postpone, or defeat the bill, for that session of Congress; while Mr. DOUGLAS voted against postponement, and for action.

At the next session of Congress the friends of the bill made several efforts to press its consideration; but its lukewarm supporters united with its enemies and gave other bills precedence. Mr. DOUGLAS uniformly voted to consider the Homestead before any other bill. Its friends endeavored, for the second or third time, to get action on the bill, on the 25th of February, 1859. The motion of Mr. SLIDELL, of Louisiana, to set aside all prior orders of the Senate, and all other bills, and take up the bill for the acquisition of Cuba, prevailed, however, by the following vote:—

“*Yeas*.—Messrs. Allen, Bayard, Bell, Benjamin, Bigler, Brown, Chestnut, Clay, Clingman, Davis, Fitch, Fitzpatrick, Green, Gwin, Hammond, Houston,

Hunter, Iverson, Jones, LANE, Mallory, Mason, Polk, Pugh, Reid, Rice, Sebastian, Shields, Slidell, Smith, Stuart, Toombs, Ward, Wright, and Yulee.—35.

"*Nays*.—Messrs. Broderick, Cameron, Chandler, Clark, Collamer, Dixon, Doolittle, DOUGLAS, Durkee, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Hale, HAMLIN, Harlan, Johnson of Tennessee, Kennedy, King, Pearce, Seward, Simmons, Trumbull, Wade, and Wilson.—24."—*Cong. Globe*, 2d Session, Thirty-Fifth Congress, part 2, p. 1236.

Mr. HAMLIN's vote in the negative, in view of his well-known opposition to the Homestead policy, was a vote of hostility to Mr. SLIDELL's thirty-million Cuba bill, and not a vote in favor of that policy.

On the 10th day of May, 1860, the Senate had under consideration the bill of that body to grant a homestead to actual settlers and cultivators of the public lands. Mr. DOUGLAS offered an amendment, the purpose of which was to extend the provisions of the bill to "all lands subject to private entry." In support of his amendment, he said:—

"I am willing to adopt the general principle that the settler upon the public lands, whether he is now there or shall hereafter go there and make his home, shall take the land at the reduced price provided for in this bill; but I wish the general principle applicable to the future—running through all time to come—rather than a mere expedient as a bill of relief to the settlers now upon the lands. I am, therefore, going to vote against the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. It being an amendment to an amendment, it is not now in order to offer a further amendment to it; but when that is rejected, I shall move to amend the bill by striking out the words 'subject to private entry,' and putting in the words 'subject to pre-emption,' so that it will then apply to all lands subject to pre-emption; and I want it to apply to lands subject to pre-emption, whether they be so subject hereafter or have been heretofore, so that it shall be a general principle, a permanent policy looking to the future.

"Mr. COLLAMER.—If it is arranged in that manner, what will become of those who have gone on the lands in Minnesota, for example? Will the Senator's amendment reach those people, and enable them to take the land at a quarter of a dollar, as well as those who may go hereafter?

"Mr. DOUGLAS.—Precisely. What I desire is, that every man now on the public lands that have been surveyed, and that are liable to the provisions of this bill, and also all that have gone on to land not surveyed, may take it under this bill as soon as it becomes surveyed; and also that all persons who shall hereafter go on the land may take it under this bill so soon as it shall be surveyed. That is what I desire to see in the bill.

"Mr. WADE.—I believe that is right. Let us have a vote. I believe that the proposition of the Senator from Illinois is right, and I want a vote.

"Mr. DOUGLAS.—I will stop right here if we can get a vote."

Again, in reply to Mr. JEFFERSON DAVIS, of Mississippi, he said:—

"Mr. DOUGLAS.—I have listened with interest and pleasure to the very clear exposition of the land-system, given by the Senator from Mississippi. It is true that this amendment to this bill will make a radical change in that system. I do not wish to disguise from any Senator, nor from the country, the full extent of that change. The change is simply this: as the land-system now stands, the speculator and the actual settler are on terms of entire equality,

taking the land at \$1.25 an acre; but, according to the proposed change, the speculator will be required to pay \$1.25 an acre, and the settler will only pay twenty-five cents an acre. *The legal effect will be to make one dollar an acre difference between the man who buys for speculation without settlement, and the man who settles upon the land and makes it his home; and that is my object in the amendment.*

"Mr. WADE.—All right, Mr. President: let us have a vote."—*Cong. Globe*, 1st Session, Thirty-Sixth Congress, pp. 2038, 2039, 2040.

And, further, in reply to Mr. PUGH, of Ohio, Mr. DOUGLAS said:—

"The effect of this amendment is that *there shall be one dollar an acre difference between the speculator and the settler*; that the actual settler may take his land at twenty-five cents, and that the speculator shall pay \$1.25. But the Senator from Ohio says, the speculator will send in advance his agent to go and get a claim under the homestead. Sir, do you think the speculator will send his agents to go and get a claim under the homestead? Sir, do you think that, in order to reduce a tract of land from \$1.25 an acre to twenty-five cents, the speculator will send his agent there to hold the land five years, and pay five years' salary in order to save one hundred dollars? No, sir. You protect the settler against the speculator, by requiring five years' residence under this bill, and cultivation upon the land. The speculator cannot bear the expense of keeping a settler for five years in order to reduce the price. It would cost him three times as much as he would gain by it. This bill, therefore, *furnishes the only efficient preventive against this system of fraud and speculation that I have seen devised.*

"I am well aware that the effect of this bill, with my amendment, will be to make the public lands cease to be a large source of revenue. I do not believe the country will suffer by withdrawing that source of revenue; and for this reason: any one who will trace the reports of the sales of the public lands for the last thirty years will find that whenever the country was prosperous, whenever the imports were great, whenever money was plenty, and you had a surplus revenue in the treasury that you did not know what to do with, your land-sales ran up to ten, twelve, twenty, or twenty-four millions of dollars a year; but the moment a revulsion came, and money became scarce and your imports began to fall off, the land-sales stopped; you could scarcely get a dollar into the treasury during the very years you needed it most. This source of revenue failed you when you wanted it, and poured in upon you when you did not want it and did not know what to do with it. It creates a surplus when the surplus becomes a curse to you, and fails you when you need it to supply the deficiency in the treasury. This very system of public land-sales is one of the causes of pecuniary revulsions in this country; and it will benefit the country, benefit the treasury, benefit the commercial community, and the moneyed affairs of the entire Union, to have this system cut off. It will remain partially under the bill where lands are entered for speculation, but it will be cut off in regard to the actual settler. He pays only twenty-five cents an acre, which is about the cost of the administration of the land-system.

"Mr. MASON.—I wish to ask the Senator from Illinois whether the effect of this amendment will not be to enable the pre-emptors who now are such to take their pre-emption lands at a quarter of a dollar an acre?

"Mr. DOUGLAS.—Unquestionably."—*Congress. Globe*, 1st Sess. Thirty-Sixth Cong. pp. 2040, 2041.

The amendment of Mr. DOUGLAS, the design

of which was to protect the actual settler against the speculator in lands, and cheapen lands to the pre-emption claimant, was rejected by the following vote:—

Yeas.—Messrs. Anthony, Bingham, Cameron, Chandler, Clark, Collamer, Dixon, Doolittle, DOUGLAS, Durkee, Foot, Foster, Grimes, Hale, HAMLIN, Harlan, King, Rice, Seward, Simmons, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Trumbull, Wade, Wilkinson, and Wilson.—26.

Nays.—Messrs. Bayard, Bigler, Bragg, Bright, Brown, Chesnut, Clay, Clingman, Davis, Fitzpatrick, Green, Gwin, Hammond, Hemphill, Hunter, Iverson, Johnson of Arkansas, Johnson of Tennessee, Lane, Latham, Mason, Nicholson, Pearce, Polk, Powell, Pugh, Sebastian, Slidell, Toombs, Wigfall, and Yulee.—31.—*Cong. Globe*, 1st Session, Thirty-Sixth Congress, p. 2041.

It was subsequently moved to amend the Senate's bill by substituting for it the bill of the House of Representatives, which was more liberal in its provisions. The amendment was lost by the following vote:—

Ayes.—Messrs. Anthony, Bingham, Cameron, Chandler, Clark, Collamer, Dixon, Doolittle, DOUGLAS, Durkee, Foster, Grimes, Hale, HAMLIN, Harlan, King, Rice, Seward, Simmons, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Trumbull, Wade, Wilkinson, and Wilson.—25.

Nays.—Messrs. Bayard, Bigler, Bragg, Bright, Brown, Chestnut, Clay, Clingman, Davis, Fitzpatrick, Green, Gwin, Hammond, Hemphill, Hunter, Johnson of Arkansas, Johnson of Tennessee, LANE, Latham, Mason, Nicholson, Pearce, Polk, Powell, Pugh, Slidell, Wigfall, and Yulee.—28.—*Cong. Globe*, 1st Session, Thirty-Sixth Congress, 3139.

Failing to agree upon a bill satisfactory to either, the Senate and House, through the action of Committees of Conference, finally passed a compromise bill, which provides substantially as follows:—

First, All lands now subject to private entry are to be open for homesteads at twenty-five cents per acre.

Second, One-half of the surveyed public lands which have not been offered for public sale, and are

now only open to pre-emption, are, by the bill, open for homesteads at twenty-five cents per acre.

Third, Pre-emptors now on public lands are, two years from and after the passage of this act, to pay for their claim, and at the rate of sixty-two and a half cents per acre."

Although not as liberal as the friends of the Homestead policy wished, the bill was a great step towards the triumph of the settler over the speculator. Mr. DOUGLAS, in common with all who had supported the policy of donating lands to actual settlers and cultivators, therefore voted for the bill. The vote on its passage was as follows:—

Ayes.—Messrs. Anthony, Bigler, Bingham, Bright, Brown, Cameron, Chandler, Chestnut, Clark, Clay, Collamer, Davis, Dixon, Doolittle, DOUGLAS, Durkee, Fitzpatrick, Foster, Green, Grimes, Gwin, Hale, Hammond, Harlan, Hemphill, Johnson of Arkansas, Johnson of Tennessee, King, Lane, Latham, Nicholson, Polk, Rice, Sebastian, Seward, Slidell, Sumner, Ten Eyck, Trumbull, Wade, Wilkinson, Wilson, and Yulee.—43.

Nays.—Messrs. Bragg, Clingman, HAMLIN, Hunter, Mason, Pearce, Powell, and Toombs.—8.—*Cong. Globe*, 1st Session, Thirty-Sixth Congress, p. 3159.

Thus, Mr. HAMLIN redeemed by his vote against the Homestead bill his declaration during the debate on the general policy,—"I am against the bill, and am going to vote against it. I am going to leave a record consistent with my judgment. I THINK THE BILL IS WRONG."

This condensed history of the measure in Congress shows that STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS has persistently supported the Homestead policy, that ABRAHAM LINCOLN never aided it in any manner whatever, and that HANNIBAL HAMLIN has persistently opposed it. Those whose interests are involved in the success of that policy will not be slow to choose between STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS on the one side and ABRAHAM LINCOLN on the other, and choose wisely.

WASHINGTON, August, 1860.

APPENDIX.

THE FEDERAL UNION—IT MUST AND SHALL BE PRESERVED.—ANDREW JACKSON

EXTRACT FROM A SPEECH OF STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS AT PETERSBURG, VA., AUGUST 31, 1860.

THE ELECTION OF LINCOLN NO CAUSE FOR DISSOLUTION.

I was asked the other day, at Norfolk, by an elector on the Breckinridge Secession Ticket, whether, in the event Mr. Lincoln was elected President, I thought it would be good cause for dissolving this Union. I answered no. [Immense applause.] The election of no man according to the forms of the Constitution is cause of disunion. [Cheers.] I would regret the election of Lincoln, or any other Abolitionist or Black Republican, as a great public calamity, an event greatly to be deplored, as bringing

an awful responsibility upon those who produced such a result; but it is not cause of disunion. [Cheers.] Such a calamity, I trust in God, is not going to be inflicted on this country; and I am satisfied that it will not be this time. [Immense applause.] But if, unhappily, it shall occur, it will be the work of the Secessionists who bolted at Baltimore. [Thunders of applause.] There is not a man of brains in all America who does not know that if they had stayed in the Convention and had abided the result, supported the platform of the party according to the usages of the party and as adopted on previous occasions, and then supported the nomi-

nee, that Lincoln had not a show of carrying but two States. [Cheers.] The only chance on earth Lincoln has is by dividing the Democratic party and letting him succeed by a minority vote in the different States. Who produced such a state of things? Those who seceded when they could not control the majority. [Cries of "True," and applause.] There is no man reckless enough of his own character for honesty to pretend that the Secession candidate can possibly carry a Northern State. Then what is the object of running a ticket, unless it is to divide the Democratic party and allow the Republican party to carry the States by a minority vote? Every Northern State, except Vermont and Massachusetts, which Mr. Lincoln carries, he will be indebted to Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Breckinridge for. The Black Republicans have no hope except through the efforts of the office-holders and the Secessionists. Why did they secede, except upon the supposition that the election of Lincoln on the Black Republican platform was preferable to the election of the choice of the party on the old platform of the party? [Cheers.] They seceded to prevent the regular nominee from being elected, knowing that the result must be, if they succeeded in accomplishing their object, the election of Mr. Lincoln. Preferring Mr. Lincoln to the regular nominee, they now have the modesty to inquire of me whether or not I will help them dissolve the Union after Lincoln is elected. [Laughter.] I tell them, Never on earth! [Cries of "Good," and great applause.] Whomever the people elect according to the forms of the Constitution must be inaugurated. [Cheers.] After he has been inaugurated he must obey the Constitution of the country; and if after his inauguration and while he has possession of the Government he violates the Constitution and makes war upon any section of this country, we will hang him higher than Haman! [Unbounded enthusiasm.]

THE UNION MUST BE PRESERVED.

I hold there is no grievance in this country, and can be none, for which the Constitution and laws will

not furnish a remedy inside of the Union. [Cheers.] There is no evil, and can be none, for which disunion is a legitimate remedy. [Cheers.] Then let all Union-loving men, all conservative men, all Constitution-abiding men, rally together and put down Northern abolitionism and Southern secession. [Great applause.] We owe this much to our children, we owe it to the memory of our Revolutionary sires, and we owe it to the friends of free institutions throughout the world. The last hope of freedom in the Old World is now centred in the success of the American Republic. [Cheers.] The enemies of free institutions are watching with breathless anxiety the progress of this secession movement. Tyrants have no hope of fastening their chains upon the necks of the people longer, unless they can sever this glorious Union and make it a mockery and a by-word instead of a shining star. [Cheers.] I did not come here to ask your votes, nor your suffrages for office. I am not here on an electioneering tour. I am here to make a plea, an appeal for the inviolability of the Constitution and the perpetuation of the Union. [Cheers.] The Presidency is but a bauble, and at my time of life would be rather a burden to me; not that I am less ambitious than other men, but I am too ambitious to have my death-warrant now sealed, to take place four years hence, and to be carried out and buried before I am ready to die. [Laughter and applause.]

If it be necessary to make the sacrifice in order to beat the Abolitionists and put down disunion, I will carry the banner wherever the American people will sustain me under the Constitution of the country. [Cheers.] I have children that I love as much as ever any parent loved a child; but I pray God that I may never survive them, and much less have I any desire that they shall survive the union of these States. [Cheers.] My mission, therefore, this season, is not to make speeches for myself, but to compare notes with you of Virginia and see whether there is no common ground of equality and justice upon which this Union may be saved and the agitators may be rebuked. [Applause.]

LIST OF SPEECHES, &c. Printed and Published by MURPHY & Co.

Non-Interference by Congress with Slavery in the Territories.

✓ SPEECH of HON. S. A. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, in the Senate, May 15th and 16th, 1860. \$2 50 per 100. It will be supplied to clubs, and others, in lots of 5000 and upwards at a time, \$20 per 1000.

✓ POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY in the TERRITORIES. The DEMOCRATIC RECORD. The purpose of this Publication is to exhibit the Democratic Record, as it was made by the Representative men of the Party, on the Doctrine of Popular Sovereignty in the Territories.....24 pages—\$1 50 per 100, \$12 50 per 1000.

✓ SPEECH of HON. REVERDY JOHNSON, of Maryland, delivered before the Political Friends of HON. STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS, at a Meeting in Faneuil Hall, Boston, June 7th, 1860. To which is added the Letter of Hon. Reverdy Johnson to the Chairman of the Douglas Meeting in New York, May 22d, 1860..16 pages—\$10 per 1000.

✓ REMARKS on POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY, as Maintained and Denied, respectively, by JUDGE DOUGLAS, and ATTORNEY-GENERAL BLACK. By A SOUTHERN CITIZEN...40 pages—\$2 50 per 100, \$20 per 1000.

ADDRESS of the NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE to the Democracy of the United States.....16 pages—\$10 per 1000

✓ DOUGLAS' SPEECH, on INVASION of STATES16 pages—\$10 per 1000

DOUGLAS' SPEECH, in Reply to SEWARD8 pages—\$5 per 1000

✓ SPEECH of HON. THOMAS J. BARR, of New York, in vindication of Catholic and Adopted Citizens.....16 pages—\$10 per 1000.

✓ ABRAHAM LINCOLN'S RECORD on the SLAVERY QUESTION, &c..16 pages—\$10 per 1000.

Address orders to

MURPHY & CO., PRINTERS & PUBLISHERS,

Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Md

Or J. J. JONES. 350 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C.





